

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Mark E. Blakely,)
aka Anunnaki Mayor Sholom El Blakeney,)
Plaintiff,)

C.A. No. 6:17-1481-HMH-KFM

vs.)

OPINION & ORDER

U.S. Department of Health and Human)
Services, Social Security Administration,)
Virginia Department of Social Services,)
City of Norfolk, V.A., Child Support)
Enforcement, City of Newport News, V.A.,)
Child Support Enforcement,)
City of Petersburg, V.A., Child Support)
Enforcement, Virginia Department of)
Revenue, Virginia Attorney General Offices,)
Sandra Austin, of Norfolk Child Support)
Division, M. Heggins, of Norfolk Child)
Support Division, Paula C. Merritt, of)
Norfolk Child Support Division,)
Daniela Wagner, of Norfolk Child Support)
Division, Mrs. Horward, of the)
Newport News Child Support Division,)
C. Schofeild, of the Newport News Child)
Support Division, Carmen M Silmon,)
of the Newport News Child Support)
Division, Lourdes Burlely, of)
Petersburg Child Support Division,)
Defendants.)

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ Mark E. Blakely (“Blakely”), proceeding

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may

pro se, alleges violations of “due process, searches, warrants, seizures, identity fraud, denial of equal protection of law, self incrimination, involuntary servitude, [and] 42 U.S.C. § 1983.” (Compl. 4-5, ECF No. 1). In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends dismissing this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (R&R 6, ECF No. 11.)

Blakely filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party’s right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Blakely’s objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Accordingly, after review, the court finds that Blakely’s objections are without merit. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge’s Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McDonald’s Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

It is therefore

ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
July 11, 2017

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.